UNITED NATIONS

CAAS

International Convention against
Apartheid in Sports

Distr.
LIMITED

CAAS/SP/1992/L.3
20 July 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES
Eighth meeting, resumed
21 July 1992

Draft report of the States parties to the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports

[The Chairman held consultations with the members of the Bureau of the States parties on 17 July 1992. As a result of those consultations, the Chairman is submiting this draft report for approval by the States Parties.]

1. The States parties held an informal meeting on 29 January 1992. After that meeting, the Chairman requested the Secretariat to seek the opinion of the Legal Counsel on the status of the International Convention and the role of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports. The opinion of the Legal Counsel and the comments of the States parties on the subject have been circulated in document CAAS/SP/1992/L.2. On 10 June 1992, the States parties convened a meeting which was resumed on 21 July 1992, to consider the following.

2. The States parties discussed, in general terms, developments in South Africa, and how they related to the purposes of the Convention and its overall scope of application. The States parties confirmed the validity of the Convention and its purposes, and expressed the view that the Convention has contributed to bringing about a process of change to begin in South Africa. In that context, several States parties stressed that the Convention was applicable also with regard to any other potential case of apartheid. The importance of States parties submitting reports as required under article 12, paragraph 1 of the Convention was emphasized.

3. Modalities for holding a meeting of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports under the terms of article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention were also discussed. A majority of the States parties reaffirmed the obligation under article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention, that the Commission shall meet at least once a year and to this end it was suggested that the Commission should meet at United Nations Headquarters in New York in September 1992.

4. A number of the States parties, however, were of the view that such a meeting would not be appropriate for the following reasons: (a) the potentially positive developments in South Africa; and (b) the absence of any report as required under article 12, paragraph 1 of the Convention. These States parties therefore proposed the convening of a special meeting of the States parties under article 12, paragraph 4 which in their view would be more meaningful.

5. Taking this divergence of opinion into consideration, the Chairman, on 11 June 1992, decided to seek the opinion of the Legal Counsel regarding the reservations expressed above.

6. In this connection, the Legal Counsel has referred, in addition to article 14, paragraph 1, to article 10 of the Convention which commits States parties to use their best endeavours to ensure "universal compliance with the Olympic principle of non-discrimination and the provisions of the present Convention". Moreover, the Legal Counsel drew attention to article 12, paragraph 3 of the Convention which states that "The Commission shall examine, in particular, the implementation of the provisions of article 10 of the present Convention and make recommendations on action to be undertaken".

7. The Chairman informed the Bureau on 17 July 1992 that he had addressed a request to the States parties dated 10 July 1992 concerning the submission of reports under article 12, paragraph 1. The Chairman requested the Vice-Chairmen to discuss this with their respective geographical groups, as he would do the same with the African Group, to urge the States parties to submit their reports before the convening of the Commission in September 1992. It was also agreed at the meeting of the Bureau that the States parties may present oral statements or any other information during the meetings of the Commission.

8. In view of articles 10 and 14, the Legal Counsel's opinion was that the Commission's task is not limited to the examination of reports and that even if the Commission's only task had been to examine reports at its meetings, the meetings should still be held. The reason for this was that the objective of meetings of the Commission should not be frustrated because some States parties failed to submit reports. On the contrary, because the objectives of the Convention are being advanced by those States which took the trouble to submit reports, the meeting should be held as is required by the Convention.

9. After further consideration of this matter at the States parties' resumed meeting on 21 July 1992, a request was addressed to the Secretary-General as depository, to make arrangements for a meeting of the Commission during the first part of September 1992, provided sufficient funding under article 11, paragraph 7 or otherwise was made available.

10. In this regard, the Chairman of the States parties sought the approval of the States parties to appeal directly to the States parties seeking voluntary contributions to the budget of the Commission to meet expenses for the

members, as well as requesting those in a position to do so and whose nationals serve on the Commission, to assume responsibility for the expenses of their respective nationals in performance of their duties in the Commission.

UNITED NATIONS

CAAS

International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports

Distr.
LIMITED

CAAS/SP/1992/L.4
20 July 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES
Eighth meeting

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STATES PARTIES FOR THE EXPENSES REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 11, PARAGRAPH 7, OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS

Administrative and financial implications relating to measures of implementation of the Convention

Statement by the Secretary-General

1. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 7, of the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports, "States Parties shall be responsible for the expenses of the members of the Commission while they are in performance of Commission duties". 1/

2. It may be recalled that the 1991 session of the Commission scheduled to be held in September 1991, did not take place owing to the non-payment of contributions by a number of States parties.

3. The expenses of the Commission for the year 1992 have been estimated at $42,000. The fund balance as at 30 June 1992 is $49,478, but the assessed contributions unpaid amount to $20,129 ($19,835 for 1991 and $294 for prior years), resulting in a cash balance at that date of $29,349. In the circumstances, it is proposed that the States parties should be assessed for estimated net expenses of $12,651, which represents the difference between the estimated expenses for 1992 ($42,000) and the cash balance ($29,349).

4. It may be recalled that the States parties to the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports at their meeting on 4 June 1990, decided that the expenses relating to the 1991 session of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports should be apportioned 50 per cent equally and 50 per cent on the basis of the 1990 scale of assessments for the United Nations regular budget. For purposes of these estimates, that decision has been applied and accordingly, the 1992 net expenses are apportioned

50 per cent equally and 50 per cent on the basis of the 1992 scale of assessments for the United Nations regular budget. A table which apportions the estimated net expenses among the 54 States parties to the Convention is set out in the annex to the present statement.

Notes

1/ General Assembly resolution 40/64 G of 10 December 1985, annex.

Annex

ESTIMATED NET EXPENSES TO BE ASSESSED THE STATES PARTIES TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS, FOR 1992

State party	1992 scale of assessments %	Net 1992 expenses (United States dollars)		
		50 per cent prorated on the basis of the 1992 scale of assessments	50 per cent prorated equally	Total
1 Algeria	0.16	61	117	178
2 Angola	0.01	4	117	121
3 Antigua and Barbuda	0.01	4	117	121
4 Bahamas	0.02	8	117	125
5 Barbados	0.01	4	117	121
6 Belarus	0.31	120	117	237
7 Bolivia	0.01	4	117	121
8 Bulgaria	0.13	50	117	167
9 Burkina Faso	0.01	4	117	121
10 Cuba	0.09	35	117	152
11 Czechoslovakia	0.55	212	117	329
12 Ecuador	0.03	12	117	129
13 Egypt	0.07	27	117	144
14 Equatorial Guinea	0.01	4	117	121
15 Estonia	- a/	-	117	117
16 Ethiopia	0.01	4	117	121
17 Ghana	0.01	4	117	121
18 Guinea	0.01	4	117	121
19 Guyana	0.01	4	117	121
20 India	0.36	138	117	255
21 Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.77	295	117	412
22 Iraq	0.13	50	117	167
23 Jamaica	0.01	4	117	121
24 Jordan	0.01	4	117	121
25 Latvia	- a/	-	117	117
26 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.24	92	117	209
27 Mali	0.01	4	117	121
28 Mauritania	0.01	4	117	121
29 Mauritius	0.01	4	117	121
30 Mexico	0.88	337	117	454
31 Mongolia	0.01	4	117	121
32 Nepal	0.01	4	117	121
33 Niger	0.01	4	117	121
34 Nigeria	0.20	76	117	193
35 Peru	0.06	23	117	140
36 Philippines	0.07	27	117	144

/...

State party	1992 scale of assessments %	Net 1992 expenses (United States dollars) 50 per cent prorated on the basis of the 1992 scale of assessments	50 per cent prorated equally	Total
37 Poland	0.47	180	117	297
38 Qatar	0.05	19	117	136
39 Russian Federation	9.41	3 606	117	3 723
40 Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.01	4	117	121
41 Senegal	0.01	4	117	121
42 Sudan	0.01	4	117	121
43 Syrian Arab Republic	0.04	15	117	132
44 Togo	0.01	4	117	121
45 Trinidad and Tobago	0.05	19	117	136
46 Tunisia	0.03	11	117	128
47 Uganda	0.01	4	117	121
48 Ukraine	1.18	452	117	569
49 United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	4	117	121
50 Uruguay	0.04	15	117	132
51 Venezuela	0.49	188	117	305
52 Yugoslavia	0.42	161	117	278
53 Zambia	0.01	4	117	121
54 Zimbabwe	0.01	4	117	121
TOTAL	16.51	6 333	6 318	12 651

a/ Per General Assembly resolution 46/221, the assessment rate is to be determined by the Committee on Contributions during its fifty-second session, and will be deducted from the assessment rate of 9.41 per cent for the Russian Federation.